



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Congress, in agreement with the nation's President, have officially proclaimed that a state of war has been thrust upon the country. And it has become clear from the acts and utterances of the nations now at war that conferences which might be held by the advocates of peace to devise peace proposals; that judicial processes attempting to secure peace; that courts of international appeal to settle disputed international questions; that all co-operative efforts to lead the nations peacefully to the peace we long for, are agencies that are, for the present, without avail. Much as we wish for them, the ordinary methods that are valued as means for promoting amity and quiet among the nations are now beyond effective use; and this, just because of the claims and the insistent aggressiveness of the arrogant autocracy which started the world-wide struggle.

Must Fight for Right.

Consequently, meeting the portentous crisis which has been raised for mankind by the autocracy of central Europe, we make public this our announcement. And we repeat, in its support, the proclamation just sent forth by our country's President of the principle under which the American people will henceforward act until a just decision befalls in the world war:

"It is the principle of justice," says President Wilson, "of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak. Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand.

"The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honor, and everything that they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come."

TWO COMMUNICATIONS

I.

BROOKLINE, MASS.

To the Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

SIR: In response to your inquiry as to the position of the Woman's Peace Party regarding the war, I enclose the following statement just issued for publication by the Executive Board:

"The National Board of the Woman's Peace Party desires to give public expression to its admiration and gratitude for the President's statement of January 8 in regard to the aims of our country in the war.

"We are glad to see in the forefront of these terms the fundamental bases of the new world-order—democratic diplomacy, freedom of the seas, equality of trade conditions, the greatest possible reduction of armaments, prime regard in colonial matters for the welfare of the populations themselves, co-operation with the new Russia, and finally the formation of a general association of nations.

"As the section for the United States of the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace we are inviting all the other national sections organized in

twenty-one countries to study the most profound and brilliant formulation as yet put forth by any responsible statesman of the program of international organization."

The members of the Woman's Peace Party have varied more or less in their attitude towards our entrance into the war. The divergence of method of the autonomous branches has been expressed in a preface to one of the resolutions just passed at their annual meeting which reads as follows: "The membership of the Woman's Peace Party of the United States is a unit in working for the just and righteous settlement of this war on a basis of democratic world organization for a durable peace, but is not a unit in respect to immediate duties and activities in the present crisis in the life of our beloved country."

The National Board recently incorporated the following sentences in one of its published statements:

"All the activities of the Woman's Peace Party have been, of course, modified by the entrance of the United States into the world war. As a national board we recognize as our most important function the preservation and increase of internationalism among the women of all nations. We have, therefore, focussed our attention and efforts upon measures aimed toward the better organization of the world in the interest of permanent peace. We have avoided all criticism of our Government as to the declaration of war, and all activities that could be considered as obstructive in respect to the conduct of the war, and this, not as a counsel of prudence, but as a matter of principle."

Despite various grossly false statements that have appeared from time to time regarding our methods and aims, we have thought best usually to go quietly on with our work and to ignore them. Let me say, however, that whatever statements may have been made by private members, speaking on their own responsibility, neither the national board nor the executive board of any of the branches have opposed the war or conscription after they became law. None of them at any time have urged an immediate peace or a separate peace.

Doubtless nearly every member is a member of the Red Cross, and many of us are doing much work for relief and reconstruction. Aside from such work, and that of conservation, in which we, with all other loyal women, are profoundly interested, we are bending our energies toward promoting widespread study and action towards securing a just peace settlement which shall prevent all future war. In furtherance of this, among other things, we are issuing a questionnaire to a selected list of thoughtful citizens, the results of which we hope later to give the public.

This questionnaire is sent in view of the growing demand that the peace settlement shall not be left merely to diplomats, but that, in addition to technical experts, there shall be a body of delegates who shall voice the claims of democracy. We believe that unless such matters are carefully considered long in advance and general principles agreed upon, there is grave danger that the vital interests of the people as distinguished from official and privileged classes will be neglected. The questions will elicit suggestions as to the best method of nomination, appointment, or election of those who shall represent the varied interests as well as the political par-

ties of the country at the peace settlement. Yours very sincerely,

LUCIA AMES MEAD,
Secretary, Woman's Peace Party.

II.

NEW YORK CITY.

To the Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

SIR: It is true that we opposed the entrance of this country into the war and used every honorable means at our command to prevent it. We believed that co-operation with other neutrals would have furnished a method of maintaining our joint rights without recourse to war and at the same time a means with which to hasten peace negotiations in Europe. We especially urged that if a democracy is to go to war it should go by direct mandate of the people through a referendum. After war had become a fact, we further urged that conscription was no fit weapon for a democracy to fight its wars with—that forcing men to kill and to be killed against their will does violence to the vital spirit and essence of democracy.

However, once the war and conscription became the law of this land, our agitation against them ceased. Common sense as well as loyalty and the habit of obedience to law counseled this course. We have never in the slightest degree urged or suggested resistance to the selective service law nor followed any other policy of obstruction.

What, then, has been our position? What have we asked of our Government during these critical months? Briefly this:

To begin with, we have insisted not merely upon the right, but upon the need for a full, free, and continuous discussion in the press and on the platform of America's war aims and peace terms. We have urged this that the militarists and imperialists might be exposed, that ignorance might be destroyed, that we might be faithful to the declared ideals for which our armed forces are fighting, and that the whole world might know us as the enemies of German aggression, but no less the friends of a Germany democracy.

We have at no time demanded an immediate peace or a separate peace. But when revolutionary Russia first pronounced its simple, generous practical peace formula—no forcible annexations, no punitive indemnities, free development for all nations—we urged that our Government should respond, stating its willingness to make peace on this formula. When the German Reichstag passed a resolution substantially endorsing this formula, we asked our Government to welcome the resolution officially, and thus strengthen the hands of the German liberals who were struggling to make it the avowed policy of their government. When the President replied to the Pope, we rejoiced to find him clearly standing for the Russian formula, and we advocated a further step, *i. e.*, that our Government should support the long unheeded request of Russia for a restatement of the Allied aims—a policy later supported by the Marquis of Lansdowne.

Today we still encourage this step. But we also look ahead to the inevitable cessation of hostilities, to the peace conference which must come. We are urging that

the ultimate agreement to be reached by the nations at that conference shall include free markets and free seas, universal disarmament, and a league of nations, the obvious essentials of an enduring peace. And since we are wise enough to know that these ends cannot be achieved at a gathering of military personages and appointed diplomats, we are demanding direct democratic representation of the people of all countries at the peace conference.

This is our complete war record. We hold that there is nothing treasonable or unpatriotic, or even emotional, about it. On the basis of that record we ask protection from the Government for our propaganda, no matter how popular it may become. We ask tolerance from those who think our ideas are wrong. And from those who think our ideas are fundamentally right, whether they agreed with us about the question of entering the war or not, we ask friendship and loyalty and support.

CRYSTAL EASTMAN,
Woman's Peace Party of New York City.

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

. . . That others besides ourselves experience our difficulty in maintaining in the popular mind the distinction between true and false pacifism—that is to say, between *pacifism* and *passivism*—is evident from a letter written to the editor of *La Paix par le Droit* ("Peace Through Justice," Paris), and appearing in the December, 1917, issue, by M. Ch. Maillard, one of the editors of the new French publication *La Société des Nations*. Calling attention to what he considers a specific instance of this confusion in a recent issue of *La Paix par le Droit*, M. Maillard defines the two forms of pacifism as "1. That of the Austrian throne, which is the pacifism of Wilhelm, of Lenine, of the German social-democrats and their followers in other countries. 2. Our pacifism, which is that of Mr. Wilson, of all true democratic thought, the pacifism that signifies horror of war and love of a durable peace. Teutonic pacifism does not wish *peace*, but a *peace*, an especial peace, favorable to the conqueror, and it wishes it now, while the appearance of victory may still be maintained. . . . Those who wish to pursue this war up to the point where the microbe of war will have been eradicated, are the true pacifists: we are these. To designate the others it is necessary to find a new word."

. . . In reply to the above plea, M. Ruyssen, editor of *La Paix par le Droit*, expresses a preference, as has the ADVOCATE OF PEACE only recently, for finding a new term for the true pacifists, probably on the ground that it is easier to put a new name on oneself than to tag another. M. Ruyssen reminds his readers and his correspondent that, as early as May, 1915, he urged the adoption of the name "*Juripacisme*" in preference to "*Pacifisme*," of which the nearest English translation is "*Juripaxism*." M. Ruyssen claims that this not alone better conforms to the laws of etymology than does "*Pacifism*," but that it also bears a more accurate meaning, since it signifies literally *la paix par le droit* (peace through justice), which M. Ruyssen very nat-